[12th October 1928

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I know, with reference to the answer to clause (*a*) of the question, whether in view of the fact that both these gentlemen are politicians of high reputation and influence in this province and one of them occupies a high and responsible office, the Government considered that aspect of the question before they came to a decision on this matter, especially when their action is liable to be misconstrued as placing them in an awkward position ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Certainly, Sir. I think it shows public spirit on the part of these gentlemen to risk their money."

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" With reference to the answer to item (5) in clause (*b*) of the question, may I know whether these applications were made before November 1926 or after that ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Somewhere in the beginning of 1927 as far as I recollect."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I know whether, if similar offers are made by other gentlemen, the Government would consider the matter equally sympathetically ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" They would be delighted, Sir."

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" May I ask, Sir, why when the Board of Revenue
12 passed their orders on the 5th December 1927, the Government order was
noon. delayed till 10th May 1928 ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" As I already explained, Sir, this is the first application for opening a plantation in these areas, and the usual procedure of the Secretariat was followed ; precedents were looked up as to what had been done when such applications were first received from the Nilgiris, Shevaroys and the Anaimalais, and the study of all these matters took some time."

Land Revenue

Removal of prickly-pears from lake bunds in ryotwari villages.

*602 Q.—Mr. C. N. MUTHURANGA MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the ryots are charged for removing prickly-pears from lake bunds in ryotwari villages ;

(*b*) under what authority is this being done and has the Government ever consulted legal opinion as to the validity of charging ryots for removing prickly-pears ;

(*c*) whether the Government have any records to indicate what customs have been prevailing in each village with regard to kudimaramat ;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that in several villages the removal of prickly-pears from tank bunds by the ryots has never been a custom ; and

(*e*) whether the Government will consider the advisability of instructing the District Officers not to charge the villagers for removing prickly-pears ; and if necessary of amending Act I of 1858 suitably ?

12th October 1928]

A.—(*a*) Wherever by local custom, the work of removing prickly-pear from bunds of irrigation tanks is usually executed by the joint labour of the village community and when any ryot neglects or refuses without reasonable cause to comply with an official requisition for such customary labour, the ryot concerned can be called on to pay his share of the cost.

(*b*) Under section 6 of Madras Act I of 1858. It is entirely a question of fact whether the local custom does or does not exist; and so no point for legal opinion arises.

(*c*) There is a paragraph in the descriptive memoir of the settlement registers of most districts detailing the works which the ryots have to attend to according to local custom.

(*d*) The Government have no specific information to that effect.

(*e*) The question of amending the Act is under consideration.

Landlord and Tenant

Settlement operations in Parlakimedi estate.

* 603 *Q.*—Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo: With reference to the reply given to the question No. 209 answered on the 6th September 1928 will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have arrived at a decision on the question;

(*b*) if not, whether the Government will consider the desirability of directing the Assistant Settlement Officer, Ganjam, not to proceed further with the settlement operations in Parlakimedi estate till the Government arrive at a decision; and

(*c*) the reasons why settlement operations in Parlakimedi estate were given preference even though such operations for villages in the Tekkali, Nandigam, Khallikote, Attagada and Dharakote estates were sanctioned earlier?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) Government have not yet arrived at a decision. They are awaiting a report from the Collector.

(*c*) No preference was given to settlement work in the Parlakimedi estate. The same officer was appointed to work in all the estates mentioned and took charge on the 23rd February last.

Minor Irrigation

Inclusion of the 'Kilanur madugu' in Tiruvellore taluk in the Imperial list.

* 604 *Q.*—Mr. P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Public Works Department Imperial list tank No. 466 of Tiruvellore taluk, Chingleput district, known as "Kilanur madugu" alias "Vishnuvakam madugu thangal," tank No. 2 of Karikalavakam tank group of the Red Hills Minor Basin, actually irrigates 131 acres 99 cents in the village of Karikalavakam, 147 acres 21 cents in the village of Vishnuvakam, 30 acres and 40 cents in the village of Vilapakam, 89 acres and 4 cents in Kilanur and 48 acres and 50 cents in Arumbakam, amounting in all to 447 acres and 23 cents;